United Nations A/C.1/50/PV.22

General Assembly
Fiftieth session

Official Records

First Committee
22nd Meeting
Wednesday, 15 November 1995, 3 p.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Erdenechuluun . . . . . (Mongolia)

The meeting was called to order at 3.50 p.m.

Agenda items 57 to 81 *(continued)*

Action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman: This afternoon the Committee will continue to take action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items. As I announced at the meeting this morning, the Committee will proceed at this meeting to take a decision on draft resolutions which appear in the following clusters:

In cluster 8: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12;

In cluster 10: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9 and draft decision A/C.1/50/L.30;

In cluster 11: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18;

In cluster 2: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2;

In cluster 4: draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.38 and A/C.1/50/L.40; and

In cluster 8: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.27.

We will also take up, in cluster 2, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1, as the Committee decided this morning.

I now call on the representative of Ukraine.

Mr. Bandura (Ukraine) *(interpretation from Russian)*: Did I understand you correctly? We asked for deferment of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2 to tomorrow morning.

The Chairman: You are quite right. Yes, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2 will be taken up tomorrow.

Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 8, I call on the Secretary of the Committee to make a statement.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become co-sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

A/C.1/50/L.3: San Marino;

A/C.1/50/L.14: Belarus;

A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2: Australia, Italy, Spain and Sweden;

A/C.1/50/L.43: Slovak Republic;

A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1: South Africa;

A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2: Belarus.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make a statement — not explanations of vote or positions — before the voting. Are there any representatives wishing to speak?

95-86678 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

There seem to be none.

Are there any representatives wishing to explain their vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12 in cluster 8?

I call on the representative of the United States of America for an explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. Madden (United States of America): The position of the United States of America on the importance of verification and arms control and disarmament has been frequently demonstrated and is well known. The United States was unable, however, to support the initiation of the study to which this draft resolution refers, because we found it premature, and the proposed items of reference inappropriate.

The study went ahead nevertheless. After reviewing the conclusions and recommendations of the now-completed study, the United States cannot endorse them either. We simply cannot support implementation of recommendations that we do not agree with on such an important subject. The United States has repeatedly urged the sponsors of this draft resolution to submit a strictly procedural resolution along traditional lines, and was prepared to join in a consensus on such a procedural text. Unfortunately, the draft resolution before us presumes that the recommendations contained in this study are broadly supported and are to be implemented by the Secretary-General. In the draft resolution Member States are encouraged to assist him in this endeavour — at least on occasion. Furthermore, in draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.2 the Secretary-General is asked to report to the General Assembly on actions taken by Member States and by the United Nations Secretariat with respect to those recommendations.

The United States finds itself compelled, therefore, to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12.

The Chairman: Are there any other representatives wishing to speak at this stage? There seem to be none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12, in cluster 8.

A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12, entitled "Verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification".

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 15th meeting of the Committee on Tuesday, 7 November 1995, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Australia, Bangladesh, Canada, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Kazakstan, Kenya, New Zealand, Nigeria, Paraguay, Poland, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Singapore, Slovakia, Sri Lanka and Venezuela.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, Georgia, Germany, Israel, Monaco, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12 was adopted by 140 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Papua New Guinea and Trinidad and Tobago advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12.]

The Chairman: I call on those representatives wishing to explain their vote.

Sir Michael Weston (United Kingdom): I have asked to speak to explain my delegation's abstention on the draft resolution that the Committee has just adopted, the text of which was contained in document A/C.1/50/L.12, entitled "Verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification".

My delegation abstained along with the rest of the European Union on resolution 48/68 of 16 December 1993, in which the General Assembly called on the Secretary-General to undertake an in-depth study on the verification issues identified in that resolution. We did so because we saw no need for such a study. We believed that commissioning one was not a good use of valuable United Nations resources and we considered that some of the terms of reference for the study were frankly meaningless. As the resolution was adopted, the study went ahead. We had hoped that the co-sponsors of the current resolution would submit a purely procedural text, taking note of the study and inviting the view of Member States.

The original draft we saw was far from procedural. It contained a number of substantive paragraphs with clear financial implications. Indeed, my delegation would probably have had to vote against that draft. We are grateful to the co-sponsors, in particular to the lead sponsor, Canada, for the spirit in which they received our suggestions and tried to deal with our problems. The draft resolution in the form in which it was submitted had been amended in a way that met most of our concerns. If it had not been put to the vote, we would indeed have been prepared to join consensus on the understanding that endorsement of the draft resolution in no way implied endorsement of the recommendations in the study, some of which run counter to our views, in particular, to our view that verification measures should be treaty specific on the matter for States parties to particular treaties. As, however, there was a request for a vote, my delegation considered that its position could more accurately be reflected by an abstention.

Mr. Kim Chang Guk (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): I am going to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12 — mainly a loose report of the Secretary-General — makes mention of nuclear issues. The nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula is a political and military one, to be settled solely by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) and the United States of America, since it was initiated by the United States, which introduced nuclear weapons into South Korea, resorted to nuclear threats against us, and created suspicion of our secret nuclear weapons programme.

It is not a question to be debated in the United Nations. In the past, the United Nations intervention created complexity rather than assisting with the settlement of the nuclear issue. The report of the Secretary-General was again an intentional attempt to turn away from the substance and nature of the nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula.

In the draft resolution the General Assembly commends the report of the Secretary-General, which is not helpful to the settlement of the nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula. My delegation therefore abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12.

Mrs. Bourgois (France) *(interpretation from French)*: The French delegation wishes to explain its abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12, entitled "Verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification". Its abstention is prompted by reasons of form and substance.

First of all, France abstained in the voting on draft resolution 48/68 and spoke out against paragraph 2 of the operative part, in which the Secretary-General was requested to carry out a further study on verification with the assistance of governmental experts.

Secondly, the study prepared by that Group of Experts, in which my country did not participate, produced conclusions and recommendations that are not in keeping

with our position in regard to verification of disarmament agreements; in particular — with respect to the principle of specificity — the verification regimes pursuant to disarmament treaties and arrangements concerned. My delegation further believes that the draft resolution, despite the remarkable efforts of the Canadian delegation, cannot be interpreted in its final version as a purely procedural text. In operative paragraph 3, for example, States are encouraged to consider the recommendations contained in the report of the Group of Experts, but above all they are called upon to assist the Secretary-General in implementing them.

Furthermore, in paragraph 4 the Secretary-General is requested to report to the General Assembly on actions taken with respect to the recommendations of the Group of Experts.

For all these reasons, France decided to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12, in the light of the reservations it has about the content of the study by the Group of Experts.

Mr. Hasan (Iraq) *(interpretation from Arabic)*: My delegation lost its right to vote in the General Assembly in accordance with Article 19 of the Charter because we fell behind in our contributions, in view of the sanctions imposed on Iraq and the freezing of Iraqi assets. Had we still had the right to vote, we would have voiced reservations on the draft resolution, particularly, on the paragraph that has to do with Iraq in the report of the Group of Experts. This paragraph has been foisted into the subject of the report and it contains inaccurate conclusions.

The Chairman: If there are no other delegations wishing to speak, may the Committee then proceed to take action on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 10.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft texts in cluster 10. We shall take up draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9 and draft decision A/C.1/50/L.30.

I shall now call on those delegations who wish to make statements other than explanations of vote or position.

Mr. Chaves (Kyrgyzstan): The delegation of Kyrgyzstan supports these drafts and hopes that they will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. Laptsenak (Belarus) *(interpretation from Russian)*: I wish to inform the Committee that the Republic of Belarus has decided to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9.

The Chairman: Note is taken of the fact that Belarus has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9.

As it seems that there are no further statements, I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions before the voting.

Mr. Moniz (Portugal): Portugal will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9 on the permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan.

This draft resolution deserves our most careful attention. We consider neutrality as a right that is inherent in the sovereignty of every State. In our view, the permanent, constructive neutrality of Turkmenistan would contribute to the promotion of peace, stability and security, not only in that region but on a more global scale.

Portugal supports this decision of Turkmenistan and believes that it should be followed by constructive dialogue on security with all the countries in the region. This dialogue should address the multiple legal and international implications. We are convinced that this process will be possible only through cooperation at the regional level. We therefore encourage such cooperation.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): The delegation of Pakistan too expresses its full support for the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.9 and hopes that it will be adopted by consensus.

At the risk of being considered out of order, I want to say that Pakistan would like to join the sponsors of this draft resolution.

The Chairman: It has been noted that Pakistan wishes to be a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9.

Mr. Osman (Afghanistan): As one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9, Afghanistan believes that every State has a legitimate right to determine its own policy. Turkmenistan's adoption of a policy of permanent neutrality would greatly enhance peace and stability in its own region and in other countries.

Afghanistan firmly supports the draft resolution and recommends to all other delegations that it be adopted by consensus.

The Chairman: I remind delegations once again that sponsors of a draft resolution should not explain their vote on that draft. They are, of course, entitled to make statements at the appropriate stage.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I wish simply to join those who have expressed support for this draft resolution. As one of its sponsors, we too wish to see it adopted by consensus.

The Chairman: The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9.

The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9, entitled "Permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan", was introduced by the representative of Turkmenistan at the 16th meeting of the Committee, on 8 November 1995, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Colombia, the Czech Republic, Egypt, Georgia, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Tajikistan, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Mauritius, France and India.

The Chairman: If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/50/L.30, entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security".

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): The draft decision contained in document A/C.1/50/L.30, entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", was introduced by the representative of Colombia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 8 November 1995.

The Committee will proceed to take a recorded vote on draft decision A/C.1/50/L.30.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft decision A/C.1/50/L.30 was adopted by 102 votes to none, with 52 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.30.

As I see that no delegation wishes to explain its vote, we will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18 in cluster 11. A recorded vote has been requested on the draft resolution. Separate recorded votes have also been requested on operative paragraph 3 *(b)* and operative paragraph 5.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18, entitled "Transparency in armaments", was introduced by the representative of Netherlands at the 14th meeting of the Committee on Tuesday, 7 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following States — and I should preface my remarks by saying that the list is a long one: Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18 entitled "Transparency in armaments", I have to put on record the following statement of financial implications:

"By paragraphs 1, 3, 4 and 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18, the General Assembly would:

'Reaffirm its determination to ensure the effective operation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms as provided for in paragraphs 7, 8, 9 and 10 of resolution 46/36 L' [operative paragraph 1];

'Reaffirm its decision, with a view to further development of the Register, to keep the scope of and participation in the Register under review, and, to that end:

'(a) Recall its request to Member States to provide the Secretary-General with their views on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development and on transparency measures related to weapons of mass destruction;

'(b) Recall its request to the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts to be convened in 1997, on the basis of equitable geographical representation, to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account work of the Conference on Disarmament, the views expressed by Member States and the 1994 report of the Secretary-General on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, with a view to a decision at its fifty-second session;' [operative paragraph 3]

'Request the Secretary-General to ensure that sufficient resources are made available for the Secretariat to operate and maintain the Register;' [operative paragraph 4]

'Request the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its fifty-first session on the progress made in implementing the present resolution;' [operative paragraph 7]

"In that connection, the activities called for in operative paragraphs 3 (b) and 4 of the draft resolution are programmed in the proposed programme budget for the 1996-97 biennium under Section 2 C.4, Disarmament. It appears under sub-programme 3, 'Monitoring Analysis and Studies' of Programme 7, 'Disarmament', of the medium-term plan for the period 1992-97.

"Provisions have therefore been made in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1996-97

(A/50/6 (Section 2)) which would enable the Centre for Disarmament Affairs to provide appropriate substantive support services to the three sessions of the group of governmental experts to be held in New York in 1997. In addition, resources have been proposed to be made available to the group for three work-months of consultancy services. The consultant would be required to have extensive knowledge and expertise on defence-related technologies, arms transfer problems and transparency. The consultant would prepare the successive drafts of the group's report and would attend the sessions of the group. Activities to be carried out would also concentrate on *(a)* operating and maintaining the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

"Should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18, its implementation would not require additional resources to undertake the activities requested in operative paragraphs 3 (b) and 4 of the draft resolution, as provision has been made the same in the 1996-1997 proposed programme budget."

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to read this statement on behalf of the Secretary-General.

The Committee will now proceed to take action by a recorded vote, first on operative paragraph 3 *(b)* of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Myanmar, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sudan

Operative paragraph 3 (b) was retained by 133 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Nigeria advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain on operative paragraph 3 *(b)*.]

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Voting will now commence on operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan,

Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Indonesia, Kenya, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan

Operative paragraph 5 was retained by 133 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Lebanon advised the Secretariat that it had intended not to participate in the vote on operative paragraph 5.]

The Chairman: I call on the Committee Secretary.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18 as a whole.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

Mr. Sulaiman (Syrian Arab Republic) *(interpretation from Arabic)*: I have asked to speak to explain my position before the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18.

The Chairman: May I ask the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to speak after the decision has been taken because we are already in the process of voting. We did not have any speakers inscribed on the list before the vote. I apologize if there was some mistake on the part of the Secretariat.

I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

Mr. Sulaiman (Syrian Arab Republic) *(interpretation from Arabic)*: I asked to speak before adopting a position with regard to the draft resolution, but I did not do it before the meeting.

The Chairman: I would like, as I said before, to call on you after the decision has been taken on the draft resolution.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to continue his conduct of the voting.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): We shall now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden,

Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Myanmar, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18, as a whole, was adopted by 137 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Argentina advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Lebanon had intended not to participate.]

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

I call on the representative of Israel.

Mr. Yativ (Israel): I would like to explain Israel's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18, on transparency in armaments, by which Israel was among the first countries to support resolution 46/36 L, by which the General Assembly established the Register. It was also among the first to send in its report, in accordance with the resolution, and has continued to do so annually. The Register is certainly important as the beginning of a long process in the implementation of global confidence-building measures. However, it still needs to stand up to the test of time and the principle of stability should be kept.

Therefore, Israel believes that the existing categories of the Register should be consolidated before further major changes are considered. In this context, Israel does not support the references made in the fourth paragraph of the preamble to "military holdings" and to "procurement through national production", nor to the reference in operative paragraph 3 *(a)* to "weapons of mass destruction". We believe that additional countries from our region should participate in the Register. We further hold that the establishment of confidence and security building measures in the regional framework of the Working Group on Arms Control and Regional Security will significantly improve the confidence and transparency in our region.

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) *(interpretation from French)*: My delegation regrets that, this year again, it was unable to support draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18 because we note, with regret, that there has not been any real progress in the matter of transparency, to which my country attaches particular importance. Moreover, we could not support the text because of the approach contemplated, which continues to give pride of place to the treatment of transparency by frameworks defined in paragraphs 3 *(b)* and 5 of the operative part. In our view these have shown their limitations because they have not yielded the anticipated results for a number of countries, including my own.

My delegation, which supports any effort to establish systems of transparency that are viable, effective and integrated, cannot sanction the pursuit of an initiative which has not lived up to our expectations.

For all these reasons, my delegation did not participate in the vote on paragraphs 3 *(b)* and 5, and it abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18 as a whole. However, we remain confident that the co-sponsors will in the future take into account the positions taken so that this question can be the subject of consensus at the next session.

Mr. Mubarak (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) *(interpretation from Arabic)*: I should like to explain my country's position on the draft resolution on transparency in armament in document A/C.1/50/L.18.

My delegation has abstained from voting, as it did last year, because the draft resolution just adopted contained nothing new with regard to transparency. The draft resolution, focused, as did the resolution adopted last year, on the Register of Conventional Arms as if it were an end in itself. To consider the Register an important stage on the road to transparency, as stated in the second preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 2 and 6 of the draft resolution does not reflect, in the view of my country, the full concept of transparency.

The Register's scope with regard to conventional weapons does not go beyond imports and exports of such weapons and unless it is expanded to encompass domestic production and stockpiles of those weapons, the Register will remain a form without content. Furthermore, the draft resolution does not underscore the relationship between conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction.

This is an important consideration to which my country accords a high priority particularly in the Middle East region, where the Israelis' possession of stockpiles of highly advanced sophisticated conventional weapons side by side with nuclear weapons poses a definite threat to peace and security in the region.

In this regard, mention must be made of yet another consideration that has to do with transparency: namely the monopoly of the nuclear Powers of the purchase, possession and transfer of nuclear materials. In document A/50/320 , distributed under item 70 which relates to the issue of transparency, we drew the attention of the Secretary-General to the fact that the United States has purchased and transferred from the Republic of Kazakstan 600 kilogrammes of radioactive uranium ready for use in nuclear-weapons manufacture. The uranium was stored in United States nuclear facilities. This conduct on the part of a super-Power does not only breach the non-proliferation treaty (NPT) but also poses a threat to the peace and security of other States, as neither the Security Council nor the International Atomic Energy Agency has been advised of the action taken by the United States with regard to those 600 kilogrammes of this material: whether they will be destroyed or used, and what guarantees are there that they will not be exported to another country as is required by non-proliferation principles. Failing this, any other state will be entitled to acquire and store any quantity of uranium it deems sufficient for its needs in order to break the monopoly of such materials.

Proceeding from this, we abstained from voting on the draft resolution relating to transparency as it did not include the positive measures that would reflect in actual practice the desired purpose of transparency in the field of all categories of armaments, especially with regard to the weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. de Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation abstained in the voting on operative paragraphs 3 (b) and 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18, which we have just adopted, entitled "Transparency in armaments". Our reasons are as follows:

Concerning paragraph 3 (*b*), we believe that 1997 will be too soon for us to carry out a serious and in-depth evaluation of the functioning of the Register of Conventional Arms and to take decisions on its further development.

As to paragraph 5, the wording might be taken to suggest that the Conference on Disarmament should continue its work in the field of transparency in accordance with its earlier mandate, which has lapsed. We are not against having the item on transparency considered by the Conference on Disarmament, provided that the scope of its new mandate be defined clearly and on a joint basis. It was for the same reasons that my delegation abstained in the voting on this draft resolution as a whole.

I have just explained my vote, but as long as I am speaking I wish to make a brief comment, almost a point of order though I hesitate to call it such. It is kindly directed at the Secretariat.

Our Secretary, with the characteristic efficiency and diligence for which we are all grateful, locks and unlocks the voting machine with admirable celerity, undoubtedly to save the Committee's valuable and expensive time. A pause of a few seconds between the end of the automatic counting and the announcement of the locking of the voting machine might also help to save time.

The Chairman: The Chair will certainly bear that in mind.

Mr. Kim Chang Guk (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): I should like to explain my delegation's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18.

First of all, my delegation would like to ask whether the Register of Conventional Arms is really helpful to confidence- building and disarmament. Transparency should serve disarmament and not exist for its own sake. The arms-exporting countries are now scrambling for domination of the world's arms market. In particular, certain arms-exporting countries are transferring a large amount of weapons to regions in conflict in pursuit of their own political purposes.

The arms Register cannot influence arms transfers at all, because arms-exporting countries are all big and powerful and arms transfers are conducted for their political and economic benefit. Arms transfer serves the arms trade rather than helping confidence- building and disarmament. My delegation therefore abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18.

Mr. Rivero Rosario (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like briefly to explain my delegation's position on the paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18 on which we voted separately.

In the case of paragraph 3 (b), our delegation abstained in the voting because we feel that 1997 is rather too soon to establish a group of governmental experts to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development. We expressed the same view last year.

We should take into account, on the one hand, the fact that the Register has been in operation for only three years. It is a very young confidence-building measure. More time is needed to see how it develops and to extend its scope. On the other hand, a meeting of the group of experts was held in 1994 to consider the same subjects, and as far as we could see from the report it produced there is no agreement in the opinion of Member States and of the experts, a common basis for consensus on the questions that require it. We therefore believe that another report is a bit premature, and for that reason we abstained in the voting on that paragraph.

We also abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 5 because we felt that work in the field of transparency in armaments in the Conference on Disarmament had been concluded. In our view, this is not an appropriate time to add any further work to the Conference's schedule on a subject that is not of high priority as regards negotiations, and we therefore also abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

Miss Wahbi (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My Government abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18, "Transparency in armaments". We did so because of certain specific elements it contains.

Sudan does not oppose transparency in armaments. On the contrary, we consider it to be a very important and necessary matter. Transparency, however, should be applied with some specificity. It should be comprehensive and fair. In this respect, we wish to state that the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms is insufficient and that it should be supplemented by a register of weapons of mass destruction, which are more dangerous and have much more serious implications for mankind than do conventional weapons.

On the other hand, we believe that the information submitted to the Register is usually inaccurate and incomplete. For example, no information is provided by the exporting countries or by the importers of weapons for use by some rebel secessionist movements and mercenary groups while such weapons, as is well known, are used to destabilize certain States and to overthrow their legitimate Governments.

For all these reasons, Sudan has been unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution as its reservations have not been taken into consideration.

Mr. Sulaiman (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18, "Transparency in armaments". My delegation affirms its full support for the international tendency to build an international society free from the threat or use of force and in which the principles of peace and justice would prevail.

While confirming our readiness to participate in any international effort aimed in good faith at achieving that goal, we wish to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that the draft resolution "Transparency in armaments" does not take into account the special situation that exists in the Middle East region, where the Arab-Israeli conflict continues because of Israel's persistence in occupying Arab lands, its refusal to implement the relevant Security Council resolutions, its continued possession of the most sophisticated and lethal weapons of mass destruction and its ability to produce the most sophisticated of weapons and to stockpile them in the region.Therefore, transparency in Israel's armaments is non-existent save for a glimpse at the tip of the iceberg.

For all those reasons, my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18. I hope that the record will show that my delegation had wished to make a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

Ms. Ghose (India): I would like to explain India's several votes on the separate paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18 and the draft resolution as a whole.

We have accepted the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms as a global confidence-building measure and have contributed to it regularly. However, we are of the view that perhaps the time has come to consolidate work on the Register and to get more countries to participate in it. We abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 3 (b) and on the draft resolution as a whole because the last Group of Experts, which met recently, agreed that no further development was required at the present moment. We therefore doubt the efficacy of convening yet another group of experts in 1997 to address the very same issue.

We are not against having the Conference on Disarmament consider transparency in armaments, although we do feel that the wording of operative paragraph 5 might have been somewhat tighter. Since we are not against having the Conference on Disarmament discuss transparency, however, we voted in favour of that particular paragraph.

The overall reservations we have on the main thrust of the draft resolution led us to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Jusuf (Indonesia): I asked to speak to explain my delegation's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18, "Transparency in armaments". Indonesia can go along with the thrust of the draft resolution. We note, however, that operative paragraph 3 (b) contains elements on which my delegation has doubts, namely, the establishment of a group of governmental experts to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account work of the Conference on Disarmament. Similar attempts in the past have failed to produce concrete results.

Furthermore, we do not believe that it is appropriate for the Conference on Disarmament to embark upon such an exercise, as it is invited to do in operative paragraph 5, owing to the need for it to concentrate on the highest priority in its agenda, namely, the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

In short, my delegation abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 3 (b), operative paragraph 5 and the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Nasseri (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation is in favour of the content of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18 as a whole and believes that transparency in armaments and the ideas and issues raised in this context are important and deserve consideration and follow-up. We are cognizant of the contributions that an enhanced level of transparency could make in building confidence among States and that it would help to improve the security of States.

Measures in this regard may be particularly helpful in our region. In that light, the Islamic Republic of Iran has provided information to the United Nations Register and is looking forward to seeing others do the same.

We would therefore have liked to be in a position to support the draft resolution. However, owing to some difficulties in relation to operative paragraph 3 (b), including the reference to the work of the Conference on Disarmament and specifically, the manner in which that work should be treated, we could not give our support for the draft resolution in our vote at this time.

The Conference on Disarmament, as the single multilateral negotiating body for disarmament, can be invited to consider continuing the work undertaken in the field of transparency in armaments. The result of that work, however, should be presented to the General Assembly for the United Nations Members to consider and to take note of. The Conference on Disarmament does not deal with an issue only in order that its work can be taken into account by a group of governmental experts who then make their own conclusions in the form of a report by the United Nations Secretary-General.

Experts or a group of experts may be invited to assist the Conference on Disarmament in its deliberations on an issue. This has been the case on various occasions in the past. The Conference on Disarmament may also decide to present the result of its work on a specific issue through the United Nations Secretary-General. Reversing that order, however, as seems to be the case in operative paragraph 3, would create structural problems.

We hope to address that problem within the Conference on Disarmament and in future consultations on this issue. For the moment, however, we have had to settle for an abstention.

Mr. Hasan (Iraq): I asked to speak to explain the position of my country on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18. Had we had the right to vote, we would have abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Sha Zukang (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation abstained in the voting on operative paragraphs 3 (b) and 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18 and voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

China has always believed that proper and feasible measures on transparency in armaments are conducive to enhancing confidence-building and reducing tension among States. China has participated in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms ever since it was established. China believes that since political, military and security conditions vary from country to county, transparency-related measures cannot fail to take into consideration the actual conditions of the countries

concerned and of their regions. They can only be set forth and implemented on a voluntary basis.

China believes that the Register is a relatively new element. Some time and experience are needed to sum up its pros and cons. The primary issue at present is to enhance the universality of the Register. Rushing to expand it is not necessarily beneficial.

As to whether the Conference on Disarmament should continue the work it has undertaken in the field of transparency in armaments, the Chinese delegation believes that this should be considered in a balanced manner by the Conference on Disarmament itself in conjunction with all aspects of its work. There is no need to reach a premature conclusion in this regard.

The Chinese delegation believes that transparency should not be sought for its own sake. The important thing is how to keep offensive weapons from being shipped in large quantities into areas of tension and conflict and truly put an end to the practice of undermining the sovereignty of other countries and interfering with their internal affairs through the transfer of armaments.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): Pakistan has reservations on what we call the supply-side approach to conventional arms control. We have, however, joined in participating in the Register, and we hope that the Register will become universal.

It is our feeling, however, that the group of experts that met last year has exhausted its mandate, and we feel that some time should be allowed to elapse before a panel of experts should be convened again to consider the future development of the Register. Therefore, my delegation abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 3 (b).

Similarly, with regard to operative paragraph 5, we abstained in the voting on that paragraph because we feel that the Conference on Disarmament is not the most appropriate forum in which to take up the issue of transparency in armaments, a measure that is at best a confidence-building measure of limited value to conventional arms control and disarmament.

Nevertheless, Pakistan supports the broad objectives of the sponsors of the draft resolution, and we have therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Issa (Egypt): I should like to explain Egypt's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18, "Transparency in armaments".

Intensive negotiations took place in the First Committee in 1991 on the text of the draft resolution which later became General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, "Transparency in armaments". It is no secret that at that time there were already significant divergent views on the substance of the draft resolution. Egypt stressed the need for certain basic requirements to be fulfilled if the Register were to become a truly significant confidence-building measure and thereby contribute to enhancing security and stability. Those requirements were that it must be a universal, comprehensive and non-discriminatory confidence-building measure, that it ensure equal rights and obligations for all States, that it address the legitimate security concerns of all States and, finally, that it provide the broadest degree of transparency in all fields of armaments in a non-selective manner. These requirements have yet to be fulfilled.

The modest steps taken to establish the Register in 1991 were then recognized and accepted as a practical necessity since the evolutionary nature of this mechanism was abundantly clear from resolution 46/36 L. There was also a prescribed time-frame for that evolution to be completed, that being completion of the work of the 1994 Group of Governmental Experts which was mandated to undertake this task.

The Group, as we are well aware, failed to reach agreement on any aspect related to further expansion of the Register. This failure to reach agreement on the development of the scope of the Register or on the expansion of the scope of the Register to include information on stockpiles and indigenous production capabilities, or on the incorporation in the Register of weapons of mass destruction, was clear testimony to the lack of political will on the part of some members of the international community to embrace meaningfully the principle of transparency.

It is our view that emphasis should not be focused on simply attracting the widest-possible participation in the Register but rather on ensuring true transparency. It is our sincere hope that the prospects for the eventual development of the Register in terms of the expansion of its scope will become less remote and that the political will which was lacking in 1994 will eventually materialize in 1997 into a willingness to embrace faithfully the principles

and objectives of transparency and apply them in a comprehensive and non-discriminatory manner.

Finally, I wish to emphasize that Egypt shall continue to be supportive of applying the principles of transparency to all fields of disarmament in a comprehensive and non-discriminatory manner that will serve to guarantee equally the security interests of all Member States and ultimately lead us to a mechanism that would ensure transparency in armaments, as was envisioned in resolution 46/36 L, rather than a Register of selective and limited conventional arms transfers, which is what we have today.

Mr. Hamdan (Lebanon): My delegation would like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18, "Transparency in armaments".

My delegation believes that the draft resolution falls short of providing full transparency in the field of armaments. It does not request all relevant information, namely, on national overall production and stockpiling of such arms. Furthermore, it does not provide for information on other fields of armaments, be they nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction.

We deplore the fact that nuclear armaments continue to enjoy special attention. In the Middle East, this is causing serious concern, in particular with Israel's continued refusal to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to place its nuclear facilities under full-scope International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards while at the same time it enjoys considerable unsafeguarded nuclear and mass-destruction capabilities.

This is why my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18.

Mr. Goonetilleke (Sri Lanka): I have asked to speak to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18: "Transparency in armaments". As it did last year, Sri Lanka abstained in the voting on the two operative paragraphs as well as on the draft resolution as a whole. It is not that we have any problems with transparency or confidence-building measures. Indeed, Sri Lanka supports transparency and confidence-building measures.

Our difficulty has been twofold. First, we believe that transparency in armaments cannot be achieved in a selective manner. We cannot take conventional weapons into consideration and totally ignore weapons of mass destruction. Secondly, we cannot be selective in dealing with conventional weapons, as is done in the case of the United Nations Register, which is of limited scope.

For those reasons, my delegation decided to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution, and we hope that in future the subject will be dealt with in the Conference on Disarmament, where we will be able to deal with transparency measures in a comprehensive and non-discriminatory manner.

The Chairman: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1 in cluster 2. The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

I now call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1, "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction", was introduced by the representative of Hungary at the 11th meeting of the Committee on 26 October 1995. It is sponsored by the following States: Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Lithuania, Mongolia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

I should also like to recall that the programme implications of the draft resolution will be issued tomorrow in document A/C.1/50/L.59, portions of which I read into the record earlier this morning.

The Chairman: I now call upon representatives wishing to make statements in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. Boisson (Monaco)(*interpretation from French*): I merely wanted to indicate that the Principality of Monaco wishes to become a sponsor of A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1.

The Chairman: The Secretariat has taken note of the wish of the representative of Monaco.

Mr. Osman (Afghanistan): The Afghanistan delegation would like to add its name to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1.

The Chairman: The Secretariat will take note of that request.

The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1. The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: I shall now call upon those representatives wishing to make statements in explanation of position.

Mr. Yativ (Israel): Israel joined the consensus on this draft resolution because it supports the objective of global prohibition of biological weapons. In our view, any arrangement reached must include, in a comprehensive manner, all the States in the region of the Middle East. Furthermore, arrangements involving compliance in enforcement require the establishment of a credible verification regime so as to confer confidence in the Convention.

The Chairman: We have heard the only speaker in exercise of position on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1.Rev.1.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 4: A/C.1/50/L.38 and A/C.1/50/L.40.

I now call upon those representatives wishing to make statements in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. Felicio (Brazil): The delegation of Brazil will have to abstain in the voting on A/C.1/50/L.40 for two main reasons. First, we cannot agree with the third preambular paragraph, which states that:

> "conventional arms control needs to be pursued primarily in the regional and subregional contexts"

On the contrary, we believe that regional disarmament is complementary to global efforts towards disarmament.

The second reason for our abstention relates to operative paragraph 2, in which the General Assembly would request the Conference on Disarmament to consider the formulation of principles that can serve as a framework for regional agreements on conventional arms control. As we all know, the Conference on Disarmament has as its primary task the negotiation of disarmament agreements. Therefore, it would not be appropriate for the Conference to embark on the formulation of principles, as requested in the draft resolution.

Those are the reasons for our abstention.

The Chairman: We have heard the only speaker in explanation of vote before the voting.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.38.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): With the Committee's indulgence, I should like to make a short statement — more in a spirit of levity than in exercise of a right of reply.

First of all, I wish to say that I listened with great interest — and great attention — to the representative of Mexico, Ambassador de Icaza, who is also a Vice-Chairman of the Committee, when he asked that I might proceed at a slightly slower pace when conducting the voting. Unfortunately, there is a very good saying that goes, "One man's meat is another man's poison." I recall earlier occasions when I have been asked to proceed a bit faster. I surely do not want a procedural vote on this matter and, accordingly, I fully defer to the judgement of Ambassador de Icaza, which I truly and highly value, and I shall try to calibrate the speed in a manner that will please all delegations, to the extent possible.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.38, "Regional disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 16th meeting on 8 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following countries: Albania, Armenia, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, the Czech Republic, Egypt, Djibouti,

Ghana, Haiti, Honduras, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

India

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.38 was adopted by 156 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.40. I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.40, "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 8 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following States: Bangladesh, Benin, Czech Republic, Djibouti, Haiti, Nepal, Pakistan and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden,

Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Brazil, Cuba, India, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Nigeria, Venezuela

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.40 was adopted by 150 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call upon those representatives wishing to make statements in explanation of vote.

Ms. Ghose (India): The Indian delegation wishes to explain its votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.38 and A/C.1/50/L.40.

We have noted that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.38 does not take into account the ideas contained in the "Guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security" (A/48/42, annex II), which were developed by the Disarmament Commission after detailed and extensive debates and discussions in 1993 and which, *inter alia*, stipulated that regional arrangements for disarmament and arms limitation should be agreed to freely among all the participating States, on the basis of the principle of the sovereign equality of all States concerned, and should take into account the specific conditions and characteristics of the region. Further, the States participating in regional arrangements for disarmament and arms limitation should define the region to which the arrangements among them apply. Regional arrangements should also take into account the need to address broader, non-military factors which affect security. Finally, regional arrangements for disarmament and arms limitation should address, in all its aspects, the question of the accumulation of conventional weapons beyond the legitimate self-defence requirements of States.

Not only do these elements find no specific mention in the draft resolution, but in contending that States with larger military capabilities or militarily significant States have a special responsibility in promoting such agreements, the text ignores the fact that such States also have wider security concerns and that each State must contribute equally to regional security to the maximum extent of its means.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.38, while making a reference to the 1993 session of the Disarmament Commission consensus report on regional approaches to disarmament, also largely ignores its guidelines and recommendations on the subject. For instance, while the Disarmament Commission guidelines recognize that regional arrangements for disarmament and arms limitation should contribute to regional security at the lowest possible level of armaments and on the basis of undiminished security for all participating States, the draft resolution focuses only on the security of smaller States and contends that the enhancement thereof would automatically reduce the risk of regional conflicts. We feel that it is more realistic to recognize, as was done by the Disarmament Commission, that the security concerns of all States, big and small, must be equally met in order to reduce the risk of regional conflicts.

The draft resolution, furthermore, seeks to address nuclear non-proliferation not only at a regional level but also on a subregional basis. Even the Disarmament Commission did not go so far as to contemplate dealing with nuclear non-proliferation on a subregional basis. As indicated by us earlier and on another occasion, and as is well known, we are of the view that nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects is a global issue which can only be dealt with effectively globally.

Let me add that India is not against the concept of regional disarmament nor, indeed, of multilateral discussions on conventional weapons. Where draft resolutions on regional disarmament have been developed, largely on the basis of the paper adopted by the Disarmament Commission by consensus, as was the case in regard to resolution 48/75 G in 1993, we had gone along with the consensus. As I have just stated, this is not the case with the two draft resolutions submitted this year. This has constrained us to abstain in the vote on both of them.

Mr. Jusuf (Indonesia): I wish to note that the name of Indonesia is not shown as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.38. I would ask that the omission be rectified in the Committee's report.

The Chairman: The statement of the representative of Indonesia will be reflected in the proceedings.

Mr. Rivero Rosario (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to explain Cuba's position on draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.38 and A/C.1/50/L.40. The delegation of Cuba joined in the consensus on resolution 48/75 G on regional disarmament, adopted at the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly, and it supports the guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament, which were debated in the Disarmament Commission at length and in depth. In the opinion of our delegation they reflect quite faithfully the interests of all delegations on the subject of regional disarmament. Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.38 refers to the same issue of regional disarmament, but in my delegation's view, certain ideas of particular importance, such as the initiative and participation of all States in a given region in negotiating and adopting regional disarmament measures, have been omitted. None the less, we voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.38 because we felt it did cover some useful points.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.40, in our view that text also singles out specific aspects in an unbalanced way. In addressing the question of regional approaches to disarmament, the text expresses certain ideas that we cannot accept and that are not in keeping with measures negotiated in the Disarmament Commission and adopted by the General Assembly, such as the guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament.

As was the case with draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.38, the preambular portion of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.40 omits the question of the initiative taken by, and the participation of all States in the region in the disarmament process. Also overlooked is the key consideration of taking into account the legitimate defence needs of the States. ON the other hand, in establishing that control of conventional weapons needs to be pursued primarily in the regional and subregional contexts the need for global control of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction is overlooked. The text also omits mention of the influence of and interrelation with the control of conventional weapons on a global scale.

With regard to the operative part of the draft resolution, we believe that the Conference on Disarmament has some very important negotiations before it, such as the initiation or conclusion, as the case may be, of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. That negotiating forum should not be distracted from its tasks of highest priority.

For those reasons, my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.38.

The Chairman: There are no other delegations wishing to explain their votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.38 and A/C.1/50/L.40.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.27 in cluster 8.

No delegation has asked to explain its vote before the voting. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.27, "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace", was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at the Committee's 17th meeting on 9 November 1995.

As the Chairman stated, a recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland,

Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.27 was adopted by 115 votes to 3, with 38 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call upon representatives wishing to make statements in explanation of vote.

Mr. Madden (United States of America): As was the case last year, the United States was again obliged to vote against the draft resolution on "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace" — draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.27. As we have repeatedly made clear, the draft resolution must at a minimum recognize the navigational rights and freedoms protected under customary international law, as reflected in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. We believe that the freedom of overflight, rights of innocent passage through territorial seas, transit passage through international straits and archipelagic sea-lanes passage should be explicitly acknowledged, in addition to freedom of navigation on the high seas.

Further, in these times of financial crisis the United States believes that the United Nations can no longer afford to support bodies such as the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean that have outlived their usefulness. Elimination of the Ad Hoc Committee, a vestige of the cold war, would be a highly visible symbol that the United Nations is adjusting to the challenges of the twenty-first century. The Ad Hoc Committee's effort in recent years to find some purpose and focus for its activities is the clearest evidence that its time has passed.

The United States believes that the States of the region should recognize that financial responsibility dictates addressing issues of security and peaceful resolution of disputes in an appropriate regional forum, as is done in the South Atlantic region. The Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean is the only such group that meets under the auspices and budget of the United Nations.

We note that the Ad Hoc Committee will not meet in a regular session this year. Although this is a positive development, we had hoped that the Ad Hoc Committee could have avoided meeting at all in 1996. Instead, the United States believes, the regional participants should endeavour to identify an appropriate regional forum to which their substantive discussions can be devolved. We look forward to next year's draft resolution accomplishing this.

The Chairman: There are no other delegations wishing to explain their vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.27.

Before concluding our work for today, I should like to go through the list of draft resolutions that could be adopted tomorrow. The Committee will have two meetings.

At the morning meeting the Chair proposes to take up the following draft resolutions:

In cluster 1: draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1 and L.50/Rev.2;

In cluster 3: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34;

In cluster 10: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.43;

In cluster 11: draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.20/Rev.1 and L.25.

In the afternoon, the Chair proposes to take up the following draft resolutions:

In cluster 1: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3.

Mr. de Icaza (Mexico)(*interpretation from Spanish*): In cluster 1, I think that the Committee could also take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8. Revision 1 to that draft resolution will have been circulated in the morning, and it is our hope that the draft resolution can be adopted by consensus. Perhaps it could even be the first item on the afternoon agenda.

The Chairman: If I understand the representative of Mexico correctly, he would like to have draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1 in cluster 1 considered as the first item at the afternoon meeting. If I am not mistaken, we agreed yesterday that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 would be the first order of business at the afternoon meeting, at 3 o'clock sharp. I would ask whether the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 would agree to have that draft resolution considered after A/C.1/50/L.8.

I would ask the representative of Mexico if I am correct in understanding that A/C.1/50/L.3 will be taken up tomorrow afternoon as the second item, following A/C.1/50/L.8?

Mr. de Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The order of consideration does not matter, as far as my delegation is concerned. I believe, however, that there might be a problem with the circulation of revision 1 to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8, and therefore perhaps it might be better to leave it until Friday.

The Chairman: Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8 is therefore deferred until Friday.

I would remind delegations that it had been agreed yesterday that A/C.1/50/L.3 would be taken up first tomorrow, at 3 p.m. sharp. I do not want to go into my motive for saying "3 p.m. sharp". Every delegation knows about the intensive consultations we had yesterday afternoon.

Mr. Goosen (South Africa): We were wondering whether it would perhaps be possible to consider draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.24, on regional centres, which falls within cluster 7, at the meeting tomorrow morning.

The Chairman: The Secretariat informs me that because of the financial implications of draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.24 and A/C.1/50/L.31 the Committee will not be able to consider them tomorrow morning. We will let delegations know the status of those two draft resolutions tomorrow morning.

Mr. García (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to return to a point mentioned earlier, concerning draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.25, in cluster 11. I would request that that draft resolution not be considered tomorrow but on Friday.

The Chairman: Consideration of A/C.1/50/L.25 will be deferred.

Tomorrow afternoon we will deal first, in cluster 1, with draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3.

In cluster 8, the Chair proposes that we deal with draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.13 and L.48.

Mr. Bandura (Ukraine) (*interpretation from Russian*): I submitted draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2 today, and we request that it be considered first tomorrow, if possible.

The Chairman: As you are well aware, according to the rules of procedure we must consider draft resolutions in the order in which they have been submitted. The first order of business will therefore be A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, and then A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2.

I would like to inform delegations that the Committee has taken action on 27 draft resolutions and decisions so far. We have done a little over half of what we are supposed to do. Delegations need not be reminded of the fact that not much time is left, and I hope that in the days to come representatives will bear that fact in mind.

I now call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I have been requested to make the following announcements.

A meeting of the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries "on First Committee matters" will be held tomorrow, 16 November, at 9 a.m. in Conference Room D. At the conclusion of this meeting, the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement will hold a meeting in this Conference Room.

There will also be a meeting of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.29/Rev.1 in Conference Room 9 immediately following the conclusion of this meeting.

Finally, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13, "The role of science and technology", will hold a meeting in Room A immediately following the conclusion of this meeting.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.